

TITLE VI/ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE

The US Bureau of the Census' Census 2000 data were used to compare and contrast the demographic characteristics of smaller areas in and near the Selected Alternative with other larger areas nearby to determine the presence of and the potential for disproportionate impacts to various underrepresented groups, in order to be consistent with the requirements of Title VI and Executive Order 12898. Census tracts are small, relatively permanent statistical subdivisions of a county for tallying census information, and do not cross county boundaries. They are delineated with the intention of being maintained over a long time, allowing statistical comparisons from census to census. The size of census tracts varies widely depending on the density of settlement. Block groups are even smaller statistical subunits of census tracts and are used in this document as the smallest level of census resolution representing Census 2000 data. Each census tract contains a minimum of one block group and may have a maximum of nine block groups. The study corridor lies within three separate block groups within two census tracts in Coconino County: Tract 14, Block Group 4 (1,351.3 square miles) and Tract 9445, Block Groups 2 and 4 (530.9 and 868.7 square miles, respectively. Included for comparative purposes are data for two nearby unincorporated communities on tribal lands (Cameron and Tuba City) that have been delineated into "census delineated places" (CDPs), the Hopi Reservation, the Navajo Nation (the portion in Arizona), the nearest large city (Flagstaff), and Coconino County.

Minority racial populations as defined by the Census 2000 include African Americans, Native Americans, Asians, Pacific Islanders, those of "other" races, and those reporting two or more races. A determination of persons with Hispanic ethnicity is determined separately, regardless of race, and includes even those individuals who identified themselves as "White." Elderly persons are defined as persons aged 60 years and older. Civilian noninstitutionalized persons 16 years and older who reported a sensory, physical, mental, self-care, go-outside-home, or employment disability are labeled as disabled. Low-income persons are those 18 years and older who had an income in 1999 below the established poverty level. Women in two-or-more-person households where they are the female householders with no husband present, with or without children, are considered female heads of household. Where the population characteristics of the block groups are notably different than the surrounding comparative areas, the percentages are shaded in the following tables.

Race and Ethnicity

Table C-1 shows that the census area in the southern portion of the project (Census Tract 14, Block Group 4) is largely White (84.7 percent). None of this block group is on tribal lands. In contrast, the two block groups on tribal lands (Census Tract 9445, Block Groups 2 and 4) are almost entirely populated by Native Americans (100 percent and 95.7 percent, respectively). Their percentages of Native American persons matches closely to those of nearby tribal communities and to those of the greater areas of the Hopi Reservation and Navajo Nation, indicating that many Native American populations exist beyond the project area. Few of the other races or Hispanics live in or near the project area (Tables C-1 and C-2).

Table C-1. 2000 Population and racial demographics

<u> </u>	Total population	White	e	African American	an	Native American	ve	Asian	an	Pacific Islander	ific	Other	កែល	Two or more races	r e s
Area	ı	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
CT 14, BG 4	353	588	84.7	0	0.0	37	10.5	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	17	4.8
CT 9445, BG 2	453	0	0.0	0	0.0	453	100	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
CT 9445, BG 4	1,523	20	1.3	0	0.0	1,458	95.7	0	0.0	0	0.0	19	1.2	26	1.7
Cameron CDP	1,030	6	6.0	0	0.0	286	92.8	0	0.0	0	0.0	14	4.1	20	1.9
Tuba City CDP	8,119	399	4.9	21	0.3	7,415	91.3	46	9.0	47	9.0	22	0.3	169	2.1
Hopi Reservation	6,836	261	3.8	0	0.0	6,470	94.6	21	0.3	6	0.1	23	0.3	52	0.8
Navajo Nation (Arizona															
	104,752	2,512	2.4	65	0.1	100,678	96.1	139	0.1	124	0.1	147	0.1	1,087	1.0
Flagstaff	53,137	41,750	78.6	1,047	2.0	4,936	9.3	723	4.1	42	0.1	3,162	0.9	1,477	2.8
Coconino County	116,320	73,702	63.4	1,368	1.2	32,826	28.2	894	0.8	194	0.2	4,645	4.0	2,691	2.3

Source: U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census. Census 2000, Summary File 3. Note: CT=Census Tract; BG=Block Group; CDP=Census Delineated Place

Table C-2. 2000 Hispanic and elderly populations

Area	Total	Hispa	nic	Elderly		
Alea	population	#	%	#	%	
CT 14, BG 4	353	19	5.4	44	12.5	
CT 9445, BG 2	453	0	0.0	92	20.3	
CT 9445, BG 4	1,523	79	5.2	183	12.0	
Cameron CDP	1,030	74	7.2	80	7.8	
Tuba City CDP	8,119	206	2.5	586	7.2	
Hopi Reservation	6,836	63	0.9	968	14.2	
Navajo Nation (Arizona portion)	104,752	929	0.9	10,662	10.2	
Flagstaff	53,137	8,572	16.1	4,173	7.9	
Coconino County	116,320	12,692	10.9	11,824	10.2	

Source: U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census. Census 2000, Summary File 3.

Note: CT=Census Tract, BG=Block Group, CDP=Census Delineated Place; # = Number; % = percent

Elderly

The elderly population of Census Tract 9445, Block Group 2 (20.3 percent) is noticeably higher than the other block groups that surround it (Table C-2). Its percentage is nearly triple those of the communities of Cameron, Tuba City, and Flagstaff and double those of the Navajo Nation and Coconino County.

Disabled

The two northern block groups on tribal lands show much higher levels of disabled persons (54.4 percent and 21.4 percent) than does the nontribal block group to the south (8.3 percent) (Table C-3). While Census Tract 9445, Block Group 4 has a level similar to that of the Hopi Reservation and Navajo Nation, Block Group 2 in that census tract has a portion of disabled persons greater than 50 percent, qualifying it as a "distinct" population under FHWA guidance.

Low-income

Similar to disabled persons, the tribal block groups in the project area have much higher levels of poverty (24.5 percent and 20.1 percent) than does the nontribal block group (2.0 percent), Flagstaff (12.8 percent), or Coconino County (11.7 percent) (Table C-3). This contrast among block groups is starker since Census Tract 14, Block Group 4 has so few low-income persons reported living there. While levels of poverty in tribal block groups are higher than non-tribal ones, their levels of low-income persons are roughly similar to those of the larger areas of the Hopi Reservation and Navajo Nation.

Table C-3. 2000 Disabled, low-Income, and female Head of Household populations

Area	Total population for whom disabled is determined	Disabled		Total population for whom	Low-ind	come	House-	Female Head of Household	
		#	%	poverty is determined	#	%	Holus	#	%
CT 14, BG 4	338	28	8.3	353	7	2.0	158	23	14.6
CT 9445, BG 2	428	233	54.4	453	111	24.5	130	20	15.4
CT 9445, BG 4	1,383	296	21.4	1,516	304	20.1	379	99	26.1
Cameron CDP	915	146	16.0	1,023	180	17.6	210	56	26.7
Tuba City CDP	7,259	848	11.7	8,007	1,119	14.0	2,040	582	28.5
Hopi Reservation	6,110	1,216	19.9	6,750	1,619	24.0	1,898	596	31.4
Navajo Nation (Arizona portion)	94,097	21,088	22.4	103,870	23,748	22.9	27,470	6,920	25.2
Flagstaff	49,232	6,920	14.1	50,269	6,448	12.8	19,355	2,166	11.2
Coconino County	107,350	16,548	15.4	113,076	13,176	11.7	40,386	4,854	12.0

Source: U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census. Census 2000, Summary File 3.

Note: CT=Census Tract; BG=Block Group; CDP=Census Delineated Place

Female Head of Household

While the percentage of female head of household for Census Tract 9445, Block Group 4, at 26.1 percent is noticeably higher than those of the other two block groups, its level is only slightly higher than that of the surrounding Navajo Nation (25.2 percentage) (Table C-3). It is actually less than those of the two nearby tribal communities of Cameron and Tuba City (26.7 percent and 28.5 percent, respectively) and of the Hopi Reservation (31.4 percent), suggesting that female heads of household are prevalent in all the nearby tribal areas and not just near the project area.